

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

LAURA L. UNDERWOOD,

Plaintiff,

v.

1450 SE ORIENT, LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:18-cv-01366-JR

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Jolie A. Russo issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on January 28th, 2019. ECF 364. Magistrate Judge Russo recommended that Defendants' motions to sever (ECF 193 & 199) be granted in part and the retail defendants should be severed from this action.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations,

“the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

For those portions of a magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations to which neither party has objected, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) (“There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate’s report to which no objections are filed.”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (holding that the court must review *de novo* magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations if objection is made, “but not otherwise”). Although in the absence of objections no review is required, the Magistrates Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard.” *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that “[w]hen no timely objection is filed,” the Court review the magistrate judge’s recommendations for “clear error on the face of the record.”

Plaintiff timely filed an objection. ECF 370. The Court has reviewed *de novo* those portions of Magistrate Judge Russo’s Findings and Recommendation to which Plaintiff has objected, as well as the Joint Response of all appearing defendants. ECF 371. The Court agrees with Magistrate Judge Russo’s reasoning and ADOPTS those portions of the Findings and Recommendation.

For those portions of Magistrate Judge Russo’s Findings and Recommendation to which neither party has objected, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews those matters for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent.

The Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Russo's Findings and Recommendation, ECF 364. Defendants' motions to sever (ECF 193 and 199) are GRANTED IN PART and the retail defendants are severed from this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 18th day of March, 2019.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge